

Appln No. 10/727,198
Amdt. Dated December 13, 2005
Response to Office Action of November 14, 2005

3

COPY**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In response to the Examiner's further Office Action of November 14, 2005 in the present RCE application, the Applicant submits the accompanying Amendments to the claims and the below Remarks directed thereto.

Regarding Amendment

Claims 1 and 3-6 are currently pending in the present application. In the Amendment:

independent claim 1 is amended to clearly recite that the clock filter is configured to detect an under temperature condition of the integrated circuit, at which the temperature is below the recited predetermined temperature, and to alter the system clock output upon under temperature detection. Support for this amendment can be found in original dependent claim 2 and at page 950, lines 17-28 of the original specification;

dependent claims 4 and 6 are amended to correctly define the predetermined temperature of amended independent claim 1; and

pending dependent claims 3 and 5 are unchanged.

It is respectfully submitted that the above amendments do not add new matter to the present application.

Regarding 35 USC 112, second paragraph Rejections

It is respectfully submitted that the above-described amendment to dependent claims 4 and 6 provide sufficient antecedent basis for the term "predetermined temperature" from independent claim 1.

35 USC 102(b) Rejections

It is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of amended independent claim 1, and claims 3-6 dependent therefrom, is not disclosed by either newly cited Chemla (US 5,805,403), previously cited Kitano or previously cited Kawai, for at least the following reasons.

In the Response to Arguments section of the present Office Action, the Examiner states that the pending claims do not distinguish over the prior arts since "under temperature detection" is not specifically recited in the claims. It is respectfully submitted that the above-described amendment to independent claim 1 specifically recites this feature of the present invention, and therefore distinguishes the claimed invention over each of the cited references.

This is because, each of the cited references is directed to managing overheating of integrated circuits by employing over temperature detection, and therefore do not teach, or suggest, preventing security attacks on an integrated circuit by employing under temperature detection as in the claimed invention.

COPY

Appia No. 10/727,198

Amtd. Dated December 13, 2005

Response to Office Action of November 14, 2005

4

That is, Chemla merely discloses either halting a clock signal within an integrated circuit, or resetting the integrated circuit when a temperature above a threshold temperature is detected (see col. 3, line 48-col. 4, line 44 of Chemla).

Kitano merely discloses either operating cooling fans and/or reducing processing of data in an integrated circuit when a temperature above a first threshold temperature is detected, or stopping a clock signal within the integrated circuit when a temperature above a higher, second threshold temperature is detected (see col. 5, line 8-52 of Kitano).

Kawai merely discloses varying a clock signal within an integrated circuit as the operating temperature of the integrated circuit increases (see col. 6, line 48-col. 7, line 5 of Kawai).

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of amended independent claim 1, and claims 3-6 dependent therefrom, is not taught, nor suggested, by Chemla, Kitano and Kawai, either taken alone or in combination.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's rejections have been traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:


SIMON ROBERT WALMSLEY

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762